

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF MICHIGAN

---

CITY OF COLDWATER,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v

CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY,

Defendant-Appellant.

Supreme Court No. 151051

Court of Appeals No. 320181

Lower Court 13-040185-CZ

---

Peter H. Ellsworth (P23657)  
Jeffrey V. Stuckey (P34648)  
Attorney for the City of Coldwater and  
Co-Counsel for the City of Holland  
Dickinson Wright PLLC  
215 S. Washington Square, Ste. 200  
Lansing, MI 48933  
(517) 371-1730  
pellsworth@dickinsonwright.com  
jstuckey@dickinsonwright.com

John J. Bursch (P57679)  
Conor B. Dugan (P66901)  
Attorneys for Consumers Energy Company  
Warner Norcross & Judd LLP  
900 Fifth Third Center  
111 Lyon St. NW, Suite 900  
Grand Rapids, MI 49503  
(616) 752-2474  
jbursch@wnj.com  
conor.dugan@wnj.com

**ASSOCIATION OF BUSINESSES ADVOCATING TARIFF EQUITY'S**  
**AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF**

Submitted By:

Roderick S. Coy (P12290)  
**CLARK HILL PLC**  
Attorneys for *Amicus Curiae* Association of  
Businesses Advocating Tariff Equity  
212 E. Grand River Avenue  
Lansing, MI 48906  
(517) 318-3028  
rcoy@clarkhill.com

Dated: November 10, 2015

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
STATEMENT OF INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	iii
STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION.....	iv
COUNTER STATEMENT OF ORDER FROM WHICH THE APPEALS WERE TAKEN AND RELIEF SOUGHT .....	v
STATEMENT OF QUESTIONS PRESENTED.....	vi
<b>I.</b> STATEMENT OF FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY .....	1
<b>II.</b> STANDARD OF REVIEW.....	1
<b>III.</b> LAW AND ARGUMENT.....	1
<b>A.</b> The Importance Of This Case. ....	1
<b>B.</b> The Constitution And Numerous Statutes Assure Customers Will Have The Option To Be Served By A Municipal Electric Utility Provider.....	5
<b>C.</b> The PSC Has No Jurisdiction Over Municipal Electric Providers Nor Property Owners.....	7
<b>D.</b> Rule 411 is a PSC Created Rule Applicable Only to Utilities Under Its Jurisdiction....	8
<b>E.</b> State and Federal Laws and Policies for Decades Now Have Emphasized the Need for Competition and Market Disciplines In the Electric Utility Industry and Avoiding Duplicate Facilities Is A Secondary Concern.....	10
<b>F.</b> Great Wolf Lodge, While Disruptive of Settled Law, Is Neither Controlling Nor Applicable to The Cases at Hand, But Should Be Summarily Reversed .....	11
<b>IV.</b> RELIEF REQUESTED .....	14

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### **Cases**

<i>Great Wolf Lodge v PSC</i> , 489 Mich 27; 799 NW2nd 155 (2011).....	passim
<i>Huron Portland Cement Co v MPSC</i> , 351 Mich 255; 88 NW2nd 492 (1958).....	7
<i>In the matter of the application of Consumers Energy Company for a declaratory ruling on application of Rule 411(11) to 40 acres of land located at 15468 Riley Street, Holland, Michigan</i> , MPSC Case No. U-17011.....	9
<i>In the matter of the Complaint of Great Wolf Lodge of Traverse City against Cherryland Electric Cooperative</i> , Case No. U-14593, May 25, 2006 at 17.....	12

### **Statutes**

MCL 117.4.....	6, 12
MCL 124.3.....	6, 12
MCL 460.10.....	passim
MCL 460.501.....	6
MCL 460.54.....	9
MCL 460.6.....	7, 8, 9

### **Michigan Administrative Code**

R 460.3101.....	8
R 460.3102.....	7, 8, 13
R 460.3411.....	passim

### **Michigan Court Rules**

MCR 7.212.....	1
----------------	---

### **Constitutional Provisions**

Const 1963, art 7 §24.....	3, 5
Const. 1963, art 7, § 29.....	5

## STATEMENT OF INTEREST OF *AMICUS CURIAE*

*Amicus* Association of Businesses Advocating Tariff Equity (“ABATE”) is a 34 year old unincorporated business association of major energy-consuming corporations who have joined together to solve problems related to the supply of electric power and transportation of natural gas to industrial facilities located in the State of Michigan. ABATE’s members from the auto, steel, chemical, and other large manufacturing industries have a substantial impact on jobs and Michigan’s overall economy, since they employ more than 145,000 people and have a Michigan payroll of over \$3.5 billion in 60 of Michigan’s 83 counties. A significant amount of ABATE’s activities involve representing the interests of its members before courts, the United States Congress, the Michigan Legislature, and state and federal administrative regulatory agencies. ABATE appears before this Court as a representative of a number of major energy-consuming corporations which collectively make up a substantial part of Michigan’s industrial economy and are likely to be adversely affected by the issues currently before this Court.

1. ABATE has from time to time been invited by the Michigan Supreme Court to file Amicus Briefs on issues substantially affecting utility rates and related issues. This is one of those cases. The Court of Appeals below accepted ABATE’s Amicus Brief as did the Supreme Court earlier in its June 16, 2015 Order. The Supreme Court’s Orders on September 30, 2015 in both *City of Coldwater v. Consumer’s Energy Company*, and *City of Holland v. Consumer’s Energy Company*, stated that motions for permission to file amicus curiae briefs in both cases should be filed in *City of Coldwater v. Consumer’s Energy Company*.

This appeal, which is brought by Consumers Energy Company (“Consumers”), argues it has an exclusive monopoly right to serve the customers in this case, notwithstanding the Michigan Constitution, numerous statutes, and the customers’ wishes, to the contrary. This asserted monopoly right, if sustained, will have the most serious adverse consequences for

Michigan's economy, all utility customers trying to compete nationally and globally from Michigan with its uncompetitively high electric rates, and municipalities whose electric utilities may not survive, as more fully described below.

### **STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION**

*Amicus* ABATE adopts by reference the Jurisdictional Statement set forth in the Briefs of Appellees.

**COUNTER STATEMENT OF ORDER FROM WHICH THE APPEALS WERE TAKEN  
AND RELIEF SOUGHT**

Appellant Consumers Energy Company seeks to appeal from a published decision of the Court of Appeals. In addition, Consumers alternatively requests summary reversal. (Consumers' App at 16.)

As set forth in this Brief, the result reached by the Court of Appeals is fundamentally correct and should not be disturbed by this Court. However, an erroneous statement of this Court in *Great Wolf Lodge Traverse City LLC v Public Service Commission*<sup>1</sup>, 489 Mich 27; 799 NW2d 155 (2011), discussed below and in numerous other cases has led to serious unintended consequences in the municipal utility arena and should be corrected either summarily or by granting leave to appeal limited to the application of Rule 411(11), Mich Adm Code, R 460.3411(11) to municipal utilities.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Supreme Courts' narrowly-decided 4-3 opinion in *Great Wolf Lodge* was an unimaginable windfall for an electric utility seeking to avoid unfavorable rate comparisons and potential competition with municipal electric providers. The anomalous decision has created the irresistible temptation for Consumers to try to extend its construction and scope to once and for all eliminate all potential competition from the lower electric rate municipal utilities and put them in a permanent declining state, unable to expand in the only areas of growth - outside their limits.

## STATEMENT OF QUESTIONS PRESENTED

*Amicus* ABATE adopts by reference the Counterstatement of Questions Presented set forth in the Briefs of Appellees.

**ASSOCIATION OF BUSINESSES ADVOCATING TARIFF EQUITY'S  
AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF ON BEHALF OF THE POSITION OF APPELLEES**

The Association of Businesses Advocating Tariff Equity (“ABATE”), by its attorneys, Clark Hill PLC, and pursuant to MCR 7.212(H), respectfully files this *Amicus Curiae* Brief and generally supports the positions taken by Appellees, as stated in Appellees’ Briefs on Appeal.

**I. STATEMENT OF FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

*Amicus* ABATE adopts by reference the Statement of Facts and Procedural History set forth in the Briefs of Appellees.

**II. STANDARD OF REVIEW**

*Amicus* ABATE adopts by reference the Standard of Review as set forth in the Briefs of Appellees.

**III. LAW AND ARGUMENT**

**A. The Importance Of This Case.**

Michigan has a huge problem with uncompetitively high electric rates. This was documented **again** in a report to the Governor entitled “Readying Michigan to Make Good Energy Decisions”<sup>2</sup>, issued November 15, 2013 by the Chairman of the Michigan Public Service Commission and the Director of the Michigan Energy Office wherein it is stated:

“In recent years, Michigan’s electricity rates have risen to levels that are higher than the national average, and also higher than surrounding Midwest states.” (page 4).

The report also indicates that these high electric rates “are the highest in the Midwest, making this state less attractive to manufacturers, and inhibiting the jobs and economic multiplier affect manufacturers could provide.” (page 6). These uncompetitively high electric rates are the rates of investor owned utilities, like Consumers here, purportedly regulated by the Michigan

---

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.michigan.gov/documents/energy/Additional\\_Areas\\_final\\_440032\\_7.pdf](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/energy/Additional_Areas_final_440032_7.pdf).



Public Service Commission (“PSC”), and who have since the report requested still higher rates. Throughout 2015 as the legislature has been considering new energy policies it has repeatedly heard testimony regarding Michigan’s high uncompetitive electric rates.

Under Michigan’s Constitution and numerous statutes, however, electric utility service can be provided by a municipal electric service provider (i.e. a municipal “utility” in common understanding, but at the PSC, municipal utilities are not “utilities” by definition under its rules; “utilities” are only electricity service providers regulated by the MPSC and the MPSC has no jurisdiction over municipal electric service providers). Municipal electric rates are generally lower than the PSC regulated utility rates like Consumers’ rates, and the option of municipal electric service has provided some relief from the uncompetitively high electric rates referenced above and are a critically necessary option for economic expansion in Michigan at the current time.

Consumers’ arguments in this case threaten to eliminate the lower cost municipal electric rate option entirely and require service be taken from only a monopoly provider. Consumers contends that customers in this case must always<sup>3</sup> take Consumers’ monopoly service and pay the higher PSC “regulated” prices. Generally, monopolies are not in the public interest and not favored in the law, so arguments to expand a monopoly, like Consumers advances here, should be viewed skeptically by this Court. Consumers’ “absolute monopolization” argument, if sustained, not only eliminates any possible growth of municipal electric service providers, but even threatens the continued viability of Michigan’s more than 40 municipal electric service providers as population in urban centers declines, and the only growth to replace lost sales occurs outside municipal limits where Consumers argues customers must only take its monopoly

---

<sup>3</sup> Since the PSC defines municipal electric providers as NOT “utilities”, a municipal electric service provider, by definition, can NEVER be the first “utility” to serve a parcel or tract.

service. Michigan clearly does not need another financial problem for its municipalities, which Consumers' arguments and interpretations here would clearly create.

Additionally, municipal utilities serve a valuable public interest role by demonstrating that electric utility service can be provided in Michigan significantly more economically than the electric service provided by the PSC "regulated" monopolies. This lower rate reality, while no doubt an irritant that Consumers and other PSC regulated monopolies hope to be rid of, stands as a powerful benchmark of what rates are possible in Michigan. Moreover, the mere possibility that other municipalities might choose to create utilities, as is their constitutional right<sup>4</sup>, to provide lower cost power to their businesses and residents has, on more than one occasion, kept unnecessary rate increase requests by PSC regulated utilities in check. Consumers' argument here leads directly to the likely elimination of these unflattering municipal rate comparisons and the extension of Consumers monopoly.

Lower municipal electric rates have played an important part in enabling Michigan to attract expanded investment in the large manufacturing industries upon which Michigan's economy rests, despite uncompetitively high PSC regulated utility rates, because municipal electric rate options were available (e.g., two large auto facilities built outside Lansing in areas served by a municipal electric utility and recent 2015 announcements of hundreds of millions of dollars of investment to expand in areas served by municipal electric service providers).

Since *Great Wolf Lodge*, however, the municipal option has largely been extinguished. Consider this real world example: Company A had two large factories making the same product. One factory was in Michigan; the other factory was in another state with lower electricity rates. If the Michigan factory had access to lower municipal rates it could compete to keep the production and jobs in Michigan. The local Municipality was agreeable to forming a municipal

---

<sup>4</sup> Const 1963, Art 7, Sec 24.

utility as is its Constitutional right – until it learned of the *Great Wolf Lodge* decision. While it desperately wanted to keep the factory and the Michigan jobs, it felt it could not expose the municipality to the costly litigation that would likely result because of the *Great Wolf Lodge* decision and the probability that the incumbent electric utility would claim it had the absolute right to serve that factory. Much of the Michigan production, and jobs, were lost to the other state. The negative impacts of *Great Wolf Lodge* are not theoretical; they are affecting peoples' lives. The municipalities' Constitutional right to create an electric utility, was effectively rendered a nullity by the unfortunate language in *Great Wolf Lodge*.

Consumers argues that if it is the first “utility” to serve in an area, it has the absolute right to do so in perpetuity, no matter what—no matter that electric service is ended or abandoned; no matter that there is no customer for generations; no matter that the premises are all demolished and the property is returned to farm land for generations; no matter that the Constitution and statutes say otherwise—no matter what. In effect, Consumers' position is that it has the absolute perpetual right to serve the dirt, even if any customer or building is long gone. This absolute claim is based on: (i) an administrative rule, Mich Adm Code, R 460.3411 (“Rule 411”) created by the PSC– a rule Consumers argues overrides the Michigan Constitution, numerous statutes, the plain language of the rule itself, plain logic, long standing practice, and even common sense; and (ii) “extend[ing]”<sup>5</sup> *Great Wolf Lodge v PSC*,<sup>6</sup> 489 Mich 27; 799 NW2nd 155 (2011). If Consumers' extreme interpretation is not rejected, it will lead to decades of unnecessary and wasteful litigation as there will be a rush to the historical records to see if an historical ancestor

---

<sup>5</sup> See Consumer application for Leave to Appeal, p 2.

<sup>6</sup> *Great Wolf Lodge*, an anomalous 4 to 3 decision of the Supreme Court is undoubtedly a troublesome case in that it disrupted settled law on the type of facts present there and forced the PSC's Rule 411 into a situation which by its own terms it was not to apply. The decision has created much more litigation. Consumers' here seeks to inflate its scope and construction and “extend” its erroneous reach. Both of the lower courts correctly found it was not applicable here, as did three Judges of the Court of Appeals. Nonetheless, *Great Wolf Lodge* was wrongly decided and should be summarily reversed. See Dissenting Opinion of Justices Markman, Hathaway, and Zahra. The case is discussed further below.

to a PSC-regulated utility ever provided service to a parcel or tract, or an adjacent parcel or tract. If so, it might give rise to this newly-created windfall opportunity created by the unfortunate language in *Great Wolf Lodge* that a PSC regulated “utility” has the absolute right to serve a given parcel even if that parcel is currently being served (and has long been served) by a municipal electric service provider.

In short, this case is extremely important to (i) electric utility customers and their ability to compete nationally and internationally, (ii) municipalities and their ability to sustain providing municipal electric utility service in their communities, and (iii) whether Michigan will be viewed as a state where there is ever any possibility of securing more competitive electric rates, rather than being resigned to clearly uncompetitively high PSC-regulated electric utility rates.

**B. The Constitution And Numerous Statutes Assure Customers Will Have The Option To Be Served By A Municipal Electric Utility Provider.**

Cities, villages, and townships have the exclusive authority to issue franchises determining who can provide electric utility service and conduct local business. Const. 1963, art 7, § 29. Cities and villages also have the constitutional right to provide electric utility service themselves within and outside their corporate limits. Const 1963, art 7 §24. The reach of a municipal utility’s service area is limited by the Constitution. Article 7, § 24 authorizes a city or village to supply electric power outside its corporate limits in an amount not exceeding 25% of that supplied within its corporate limits except as greater amounts may be authorized by law. The Legislature removed the restriction on the amount of electric power that a city or village may supply outside its corporate limits but imposed two additional restrictions: (1) a city or village may, with limited exceptions, supply electric power beyond municipal units if they are adjacent to the city or village; and (2) a city or village may not extend service to a customer already receiving that service from another utility. MCL 124.3 (cities and villages); MCL 117.4f(c)

(home rule cities). These are the only limitations on the constitutional authority of a city or village to supply electric power outside of its corporate limits. Apart from these limitations, a city or village may serve any prospective customer in any municipal area in which it holds a franchise.

In comparison, a utility regulated by the PSC, in addition to securing a locally granted franchise, must obtain a certificate of convenience and necessity from the PSC. MCL 460.501 et seq. Municipal utilities are not regulated by the PSC so they are not required to obtain a certificate of convenience and necessity.

In municipalities where more than one utility is franchised to operate (typically a PSC-regulated utility and a municipal utility), the PSC and the Legislature have each separately enacted rules governing which utility may provide service to a particular customer. Accordingly, the PSC's Rule 411 governs competition between utilities that are regulated by the PSC. And correspondingly, the Legislature has enacted statutory provisions applicable when at least one of the competing utilities is a municipal utility. These statutory provisions prohibit extension of service to a customer already receiving service from another utility without the written permission of the other utility. MCL 124.3(2); MCL 460.10y(2).

Rule 411 and the statutory municipal provisions do not apply in the same fact settings and are mutually exclusive. Rule 411 applies when both or all of the utilities are subject to the PSC's jurisdiction. The statutory municipal provisions apply when a municipal electric provider is involved.

As it did in the Holland case, Consumers asserts that it has the exclusive right to serve here under both Rule 411 and the statutory municipal provisions governing competition with and between municipal utilities. As argued below, Consumers' assertions are wrong on both counts.

**C. The PSC Has No Jurisdiction Over Municipal Electric Providers Nor Property Owners.**

---

Municipal utilities are not regulated by the PSC. MCL 460.6(1) (“The Public Service Commission is vested with complete power and jurisdiction to regulate all public utilities in the state except a municipally owned utility...”); MCL 460.10y(11) (“As provided in section 6, the commission does not have jurisdiction over a municipally owned utility,”). Further, the administrative rule involved in this case, Rule 411, Mich Adm Code, R 460.3411, on its face, does not apply to municipal utilities. Mich Adm Code R 460.3102(1). (“‘Utility’ means an electric company, whether private, corporate, or cooperative, that operates under the jurisdiction of the commission.”) The Legislature itself has recognized even more times that Rule 411 is not applicable to a municipal utility unless the municipal utility affirmatively elects to be governed under it. MCL 460.10y(3).

Additionally, contrary to Consumers assertions, neither the PSC nor its Rule 411 regulate “the rights of land owners.” Consumers App., p 10. The PSC is an administrative agency created by the legislature with only the specific jurisdiction and powers granted by the legislature. *Huron Portland Cement Co v MPSC*, 351 Mich 255: 88 NW2nd 492 (1958). Nowhere has any statutory authority been cited, nor can there be, for the PSC to regulate landowners as utility customers. The PSC’s jurisdiction is over the rates and services provided by public utility companies as provided by law<sup>7</sup>, NOT landowners nor prospective utility customers. What Consumers references is the unfortunate and erroneous language in *Great Wolf Lodge* implying such a stunning judicial expansion of an administrative agency’s jurisdiction for which there is no statutory authority whatsoever. *Great Wolf Lodge* and the disruptions it has singularly created are discussed further below.

---

<sup>7</sup> MCL 460.6.

**D. Rule 411 is a PSC Created Rule Applicable Only to Utilities Under Its Jurisdiction.**

---

Rule 411 governs competition for electric delivery service among utilities regulated by the MPSC. As relevant here, Rule 411 provides that:

(11) The first utility serving a customer pursuant to these rules is entitled to serve the entire electric load on the premises of that customer even if another utility is closer to a portion of the customer's load.

The rule established by subsection 11 of Rule 411 is sometimes referred to as the “rule of first entitlement,” “first to serve the premises rule,” or the “premises rule.”

By its own terms, Rule 411 applies *only* to utilities which are regulated by the PSC. The term “utility” is defined as follows:

(1) “Utility” means an electric company, whether private, corporate, or cooperative, that operates under the jurisdiction of the commission.

Mich Adm Code, R 460.3102(1) (emphasis added). The PSC's rules further expressly state that they apply only to regulated utilities:

(1) These rules apply to electric utilities that operate within the state of Michigan under the jurisdiction of the public service commission. Mich Adm Code, R 460.3101.

As discussed above, municipal utilities are not within the PSC's jurisdiction. Accordingly, on its face, Rule 411 does not apply here. There is no statute giving the PSC jurisdiction or authority over municipally-owned utilities such as the Appellees. To the contrary, at least three statutes expressly state that the MPSC does *not* have jurisdiction over municipal utilities. See MCL 460.6(1) (“The public service commission is vested with complete power and jurisdiction to regulate all public utilities in the state except a municipally owned utility...”); MCL 460.10y(11) (“As provided in section 6, the commission does not have jurisdiction over a municipally owned utility...”); MCL 460.54 (“The power and authority granted by this act shall

not extend to, or include, any power of regulation or control of any municipally owned utility...”). Thus, rules of the PSC have no applicability to municipal utilities.

The PSC itself has correctly recognized that Rule 411 is inapplicable in competitive disputes involving municipal utilities. In response to the filing of the *Holland* case, Consumers filed a request with the PSC for a declaratory ruling affirming Consumers’ exclusive right to provide service to the property at issue in that case. The PSC declined Consumers’ request stating:

The Commission finds that, if it were to issue a declaratory ruling in this case, it would not be binding on HBPW [Holland Board of Public Works] or Benjamin’s Hope [the customer]. As discussed above, HBPW and Benjamin’s Hope chose not to intervene in this case, and thus are not parties to this action. In addition, pursuant to MCL 460.6, the Commission does not have jurisdiction to regulate municipally-owned utilities such as HBPW. As a result, the Commission finds that Consumers’ request for declaratory relief should be denied. *In the matter of the application of Consumers Energy Company for a declaratory ruling on application of Rule 411(11) to 40 acres of land located at 15468 Riley Street, Holland, Michigan*, MPSC Case No. U-17011, at 3-4.<sup>8</sup>

It is clear enough from the text of the PSC’s rules that they do *not* apply to a municipal utility. The Legislature has also made it clear that Rule 411 does not apply *unless* the municipal utility unilaterally elects to be governed by MCL 460.10y(3). Consumers’ interpretation would completely nullify this statute. MCL 460.10y(3) provides that :

With respect to any electric utility regarding delivery service to customers located outside of the municipal boundaries of the municipality that owns the utility, a governing body of a municipally owned utility may elect to operate in compliance with R 460.3411 of the Michigan administrative code, as in effect on June 5, 2000. However, compliance with R 460.3411(13) of the

---

<sup>8</sup> Available at <http://efile.mpsc.state.mi.us/efile/docs/17011/0020.pdf>.



Michigan administrative code is not required for the municipally owned utility...<sup>9</sup>

Appellees have not elected to be governed by Rule 411, so Rule 411 is inapplicable here.

**E. State and Federal Laws and Policies for Decades Now Have Emphasized the Need for Competition and Market Disciplines In the Electric Utility Industry and Avoiding Duplicate Facilities Is A Secondary Concern**

Consumers claims the PSC's Rule 411's "entire reason for being" is the avoidance of duplication of facilities. Consumers App at 12-13. And, further, Consumers argues "the manifest intent of the Legislature" was to eliminate the unnecessary cost in the form of duplicate electric utilities." Consumers App p. 14. These claims are both antiquated as well as erroneous. Rule 411 was first adopted many decade ago<sup>10</sup> when monopoly utility service was more the norm.

Much has changed since then. Michigan is one of 16 states that have electricity service competition,<sup>11</sup> though Consumers is actively working to legislatively eliminate customer choice and such competition.<sup>12</sup> Electric utility competition inherently requires some amount of duplicate facilities. The Michigan Legislature<sup>13</sup>, as well as the federal government<sup>14</sup>, has for decades now been implementing policies designed to introduce more competition and market discipline into the electric utility marketplace, which brings with it the inherent and necessary duplication of

<sup>9</sup> Consumers' position here stands this statute on its head. Under Consumers' interpretation, whether Rule 411 is applicable is no longer the option of the municipal utility; it is the option of the PSC-regulated utility. That is *not* the law.

<sup>10</sup> Rule 411 was adopted in 1983 as part of the "Technical Standards for Electric Service".

<sup>11</sup> [http://www.michigan.gov/documents/energy/electricc\\_report\\_440539\\_7.pdf](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/energy/electricc_report_440539_7.pdf), p. 13.

<sup>12</sup> If Consumers legislative efforts were to succeed and *Great Wolf Lodge* were to stand, it's desire for an absolute monopoly would have largely been accomplished.

<sup>13</sup> See The Customer Choice and Electric Reliability Act, MCL 460.10 the purpose of which was "To ensure that all retail customers in this state of electric power have a choice of electric suppliers." MCL 460.10(2)(a).

<sup>14</sup> See landmark competition order of Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Order 888, issued April 24, 1996, which "requires all public utilities that own, control or operate facilities used for transmitting electric energy in interstate commerce to have on file open access non-discriminatory transmission tariffs that contain minimum terms and conditions of non-discriminatory service". 75 FERC 61,080 and numerous subsequent orders.

some facilities, in order to give customers more competitive lower rates and a choice of electricity providers. The overriding policies of the current day are that competition provides more cost discipline and benefits to the public than avoiding any duplicate facilities. In short, avoiding duplicate facilities is not the concern it once was, and it has been supplanted by laws and policies thought to provide greater public interest benefits (i.e., encouraging competition, lower rates, and allowing some duplication). This Court should not advance antiquated notions long superseded by more recent Michigan Legislative enactments and federal laws and policies in order for Consumers to advance its outdated “absolute monopoly” desires .

**F. Great Wolf Lodge, While Disruptive of Settled Law, Is Neither Controlling Nor Applicable to The Cases at Hand, But Should Be Summarily Reversed**

The lower courts’ conclusions here that neither *Great Wolf Lodge*<sup>15</sup> nor Rule 411 was applicable is consistent with longstanding understanding, practice and law. Nonetheless, this Court should revisit and summarily reverse *Great Wolf Lodge* and re-settle the longstanding law and practice the decision has disturbed. This Court should not advance Consumers’ efforts to construe *Great Wolf Lodge* so as to enlarge and extend its monopoly, eliminate potential competition, and undermine municipal utilities’ sustainability.

Prior to *Great Wolf Lodge*, no one in the electric utility industry thought that PSC Rule 411 and its “premises rule” had any application to municipal utilities.

This fact is well illustrated by the opinion issued by the PSC itself in the contested case proceeding which was the subject of the Supreme Court’s review in *Great Wolf Lodge*. There,

---

<sup>15</sup> The Supreme Courts’ narrowly-decided 4-3 opinion in *Great Wolf Lodge* was an unimaginable windfall for an electric utility seeking to avoid unfavorable rate comparisons and potential competition. The decision has created the irresistible temptation for Consumers to try to extend its construction and scope to once and for all eliminate all potential competition from the lower electric rate municipal utilities and put them in a declining state, unable to expand in the only areas of growth - outside their limits, and at risk of not surviving.

the PSC said “Rule 411 does not purport to alter the rights and obligations of a non-jurisdictional utility,” citing the rule applying Rule 411 only to utilities “Operat[ing] under the jurisdiction of the commission.” *In the matter of the Complaint of Great Wolf Lodge of Traverse City against Cherryland Electric Cooperative*, Case No. U-14593, May 25, 2006 at 17. (emphasis added).

Before *Great Wolf Lodge*, it was universally understood and accepted that competition between PSC-regulated utilities was governed by PSC Rule 411, and competition with municipal utilities was governed by the “no switch” rules in MCL 124.3(2), MCL 117.4f, and MCL 460.10y (the “No Switch Statutes”). The system worked; and it worked without market disruptions and wasteful duplications; but not since *Great Wolf Lodge*.

Rule 411’s premises rule and the No Switch Statutes are mutually exclusive. The premises rule, as interpreted by the Supreme Court in *Great Wolf Lodge*, apparently gives the first PSC-regulated “utility” the right to provide service on a tract of land and the perpetual and exclusive right to provide service to the entire tract, no matter how many times that tract is subdivided, no matter whether any service is currently being provided, and no matter whether a “customer” even exists.<sup>16</sup> Thus, under the premises rule as argued by Consumers, a vacant parcel with no structures could be subject to the exclusive right of entitlement of a utility which provided service to some other part of the tract generations earlier. Thus, totally unbeknownst to a prospective buyer or developer, Consumers argument amounts to claiming an unrecorded restriction running with the land. This could never happen under the No Switch Statutes because in the absence of a current occupant or building or facilities, there is no “customer” (under any definition) and no prohibition against service being provided by any other utility operating in the area that the customer chooses. Because the premises rule and the No Switch Statutes are

---

<sup>16</sup> Three dissenting Justices in *Great Wolf Lodge* were more correct in concluding that a utility’s claim to serve cannot continue when no “customer” even exists any longer.

mutually exclusive, the net effect of the position advocated by Consumers is the displacement by a mere administrative rule of no less than three statutes enacted by the Legislature.

PSC-regulated utilities want municipal utilities to be subject to Rule 411 and the premises rule because a municipal utility can *never* win competitive skirmishes under Rule 411. This is because a municipal utility is not a “utility” as the term is defined for purposes of Rule 411. *See*, Mich Adm Code, R 460.3102(1). Because a municipal utility is not a “utility,” it can never be the *first* utility to serve a premises and, therefore, it can never be the beneficiary of the premises rule. Thus, this is a perfect outcome for PSC-regulated utilities, since, by definition, they will always be the first “utility” to serve.

This scenario where the PSC-regulated utility always wins is not only obviously unfair and unreasonable, it was previously never allowed to occur under settled law. Since *Great Wolf Lodge*, however, we have seen the elevation of the PSC’s Rule 411 above Legislative enactments resulting in manifest injustice and unfairness, as well as more unnecessary litigation, and an alarming chilling effect on municipalities’ constitutional right to create an electric utility if they must face the prospect of costly litigation from large incumbent monopoly utilities. This Court should re-settle the law disturbed by *Great Wolf Lodge* and summarily reverse that decision as 3 Dissenting Justices in *Great Wolf Lodge* had originally concluded.

**IV. RELIEF REQUESTED**

**WHEREFORE**, ABATE requests this Court to find that neither Rule 411 nor *Great Wolf Lodge* apply to these facts and circumstances, but to also revisit and summarily reverse Great Wolf Lodge as wrongly decided.

Respectfully submitted,

**CLARK HILL PLC**

By: /s/ Roderick S. Coy  
Roderick S. Coy (P12290)  
Attorney for *Amicus Curiae* Association of  
Businesses Advocating Tariff Equity  
212 E. Grand River Avenue  
Lansing, MI 48906  
(517) 318-3028  
rcoy@clarkhill.com

Dated: November 10, 2015